UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,969	12/19/2001	C. Kevin McIntyre	10008145-1	1411

7590 04/06/2006	EXAMINER
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY	MILIA, MARK R

Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO   80527-2400

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/027,969	MCINTYRE, C. KEVIN
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Mark R. Milia	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 January 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's amendment was received on 1/17/06 and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-36 are pending.

Drawings

2.   Applicant's amendment to Figure 1 to insert reference character "29" and to the specification to insert reference character "50" has overcome the objection as cited in the previous Office Action. Therefore the objection has been withdrawn.

Specification

3.   Applicant's amendment to the specification to correct minor informalities has overcome the objection as cited in the previous Office Action. Therefore the objection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 1-36, more specifically claims 1, 10, 20, 24, and 31, wherein on pages 15-21, the applicant asserts that the references of Kougiouris and Kraslavsky fail to disclose "providing a second event log maintained in said memory". The examiner respectfully disagrees as the combination of Kougiouris and Kraslavsky do disclose such a feature. Particularly, Kougiouris discloses the need to log various types of events (see paragraphs [0033]-[0040]) and also shows that the client-side logging component is capable of receiving loggable events from a module and storing these events in a queue that will later be sent to the server-side component for eventual storage. Further, Kraslavsky discloses the need for multiple logs for logging different types of events (see column 9 lines 42-45, column 14 lines 56-58, and column 17 lines 64-66). Thus, Kraslavsky discloses a second event log maintained in memory. Therefore the combination of Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the claimed limitations set forth in claims 1, 10, 20, 24, and 31 regarding a second event log being maintained in a memory as the combination shows that multiple event logs may be needed to properly store information pertaining to different event types.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-36, as cited in the previous Office Action, is maintained and repeated in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

6.   Claims 1-8, 10-13, 17, 20-22, 24-29, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris in view of Kraslavsky.

        Regarding claims 1 and 24, Kougiouris discloses a method of selectively tracking

events, the method comprising: providing a first event log maintained in memory, said

first event log configurable by a user (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011], [0033]-[0038],

[0047], [0059]-[0062], and [0075]), providing a second event log maintained in said

memory (see paragraphs [0032]-[0040], reference shows that there are a plurality of

modules that may need to log various types of events, each log being stored in a file,

database, external server, etc., which is analogous to a second event log in the claim

limitation), configuring said first event log to accept and maintain a selection of selected

event messages (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0033]-[0038], [0041], [0045], and [0059]-

[0062]), providing a monitoring device to detect an event (see paragraphs [0032],

[0049], and [0075]), activating said monitoring device in response to said event (see

paragraphs [0033] and [0075]), generating an event message with said monitoring

device upon said activation (see paragraphs [0033]-[0038], [0042], and [0075]),

conveying said event message to said first event log (see paragraphs [0033]-[0038] and

[0075]), examining said event message to determine if said event message is one of

said selected event messages (see paragraphs [0038], [0040]-[0041], [0049], and

[0075]), and writing said event message into said first event log if said event message is

said one of said selected event messages, such that said one of said selected event

messages is maintained therein for tracking said event (see paragraphs [0032]-[0041],

[0049], and [0075]).

Kougiouris does not disclose expressly providing a printer including a memory.

Kraslavsky discloses providing a printer including a memory (see Fig. 3 (144)

and column 8 lines 9-23), providing a first event log maintained in said memory, said

first event log configurable by a user of said printer (see column 9 lines 35-45, column

10 lines 27-30, column 17 line 31-column 18 line 2, and column 33 line 57-column 34

line 11), providing a second event log maintained in said memory (see column 9 lines

42-45, column 14 lines 56-58, and column 17 lines 64-66), configuring said first event

log to accept and maintain a selection of selected event messages (see column 17 line

31-column 18 line 2 and column 33 line 57-column 34 line 11) examining said event

message to determine if said event message is one of said selected event messages

(see column 44 line 55-column 46 line 41), and writing said event message into said

first event log if said event message is said one of said selected event messages, such

that said one of said selected event messages is maintained therein for tracking said

event (see column 44 line 55-column 46 line 41).

Regarding claims 10, 20, and 31 Kougiouris discloses a method of

simultaneously tracking events, comprising: providing a printer including a memory;

providing a first event log maintained in said memory (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011],

[0033]-[0038], [0047], [0059]-[0062], and [0075]), providing a second event log

maintained in said memory (see paragraphs [0032]-[0040], reference shows that there

are a plurality of modules that may need to log various types of events, each log being

stored in a file, database, external server, etc., which is analogous to a second event

log in the claim limitation), providing a monitoring device to detect an event occurring on

said printer (see paragraphs [0032], [0049], and [0075]), activating said monitoring

device in response to said event (see paragraphs [0033] and [0075]), generating an

event message with said monitoring device upon said activation (see paragraphs

[0032]-[0041], [0049], and [0075]), writing said event message into said first event log,

such that said event message is maintained therein for tracking said event; and writing

said event message into said second event log, such that said event message is

maintained therein for tracking said event (see paragraphs [0032]-[0041], [0049], and

[0075]).

Kougiouris does not disclose expressly providing a printer including a memory.

Kraslavsky discloses providing a printer including a memory (see Fig. 3 (144)

and column 8 lines 9-23), providing a first event log maintained in said memory, said

first event log configurable by a user of said printer (see column 9 lines 35-45, column

10 lines 27-30, column 17 line 31-column 18 line 2, and column 33 line 57-column 34

line 11), configuring said first event log to accept and maintain a selection of selected

event messages (see column 17 line 31-column 18 line 2 and column 33 line 57-column

34 line 11) examining said event message to determine if said event message is one of

said selected event messages (see column 44 line 55-column 46 line 41), and writing

said event message into said first event log if said event message is said one of said

selected event messages, such that said one of said selected event messages is

maintained therein for tracking said event (see column 44 line 55-column 46 line 41).

Kougiouris & Kraslavsky are combinable because they are from the same field of

endeavor, systems for logging events.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to combine the logging of printer events and storing the log in the memory

of the printer as described by Kraslavsky with the system of Kougiouris.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide relevant

feedback information about the functioning of a printer to aid in development and

debugging (see paragraphs [0003], [0004], and [0007] of Kougiouris).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kraslavsky with Kougiouris to

obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 10, 20, 24, and 31.

Regarding claims 2 and 25, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system

discussed in claims 1 and 24, and Kougiouris further discloses providing a second event

log maintained in said memory (see paragraphs [0032]-[0037], reference shows that

there are a plurality of modules that may need to log various types of events, each log

being stored in a file, database, external server, etc., which is analogous to a second

event log in the claim limitation), conveying said event message to said second event

log (see paragraphs [0033]-[0038] and [0075]), and writing said event message into said

second event log, such that said event message is maintained therein for tracking said

event (see paragraphs [0032]-[0041], [0049], and [0075]).

Regarding claim 3, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in

claim 2, and Kougiouris further discloses wherein said second event log includes one of

an event log configurable by said user of said printer and an event log not configurable

by a user of said printer (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011], [0047], and [0059]-[0062]).

Regarding claims 4 and 26, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system

discussed in claims 3 and 25, and Kougiouris further discloses configuring said second

event log to accept and maintain said selection of selected event messages (see Fig. 3

and paragraphs [0011], [0033]-[0038], [0040], [0041], [0045], [0047], and [0059]-[0062]).

Regarding claims 5 and 27, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system

discussed in claims 4 and 26, and Kougiouris further discloses examining said event

message to determine if said event message comprises said one of said selected event

messages (see paragraphs [0038]-[0040], [0049], and [0075]).

Regarding claims 6 and 19, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system

discussed in claims 1 and 10, and Kraslavsky further discloses wherein said event

comprises an error occurring on said printer (see column 45 lines 50-60).

Regarding claims 7 and 28, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system

discussed in claims 1 and 24, and Kraslavsky further discloses wherein said first event

log comprises a wraparound file (see column 45 lines 19-21).

Regarding claims 8 and 29, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system

discussed in claims 1 and 24, and Kougiouris further discloses selecting said selected

event messages from said first event log and displaying said selected event messages in a virtual event log (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0046]).

Regarding claim 11, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claim 10, and Kougiouris further discloses wherein said second event log includes an event log configurable by a user of said printer (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011], [0047], and [0059]-[0062]).

Regarding claim 12, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claim 11, and Kougiouris further discloses configuring said second event log to accept and maintain a selection of selected event messages (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011], [0033]-[0038], [0040], [0041], [0045], [0047], and [0059]-[0062]).

Regarding claim 13, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claim 12, and Kougiouris further discloses examining said event message to determine if said event message includes one of said selected event messages (see paragraphs [0038]-[0040], [0049], and [0075]).

Regarding claim 17, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claim 12, and Kougiouris further discloses wherein said second event log may be reset by said user using an interface (see Fig. 3 and paragraph [0046]).

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claim 20, and Kougiouris further discloses wherein said second event log includes a second event log configurable by a user of said printer to accept and maintain a selection of selected event messages (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011], [0033]-[0038], [0040], [0041], [0045], [0047], and [0059]-[0062]).

Regarding claims 22 and 32, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claims 21 and 31, and Kougiouris further discloses wherein said second event log examines said event messages to determine if said event messages are one of said selected event messages, and stores and maintains said selected event messages (see Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011], [0033]-[0038], [0040], [0041], [0045], [0047], [0049], [0059]-[0062], and [0075]).

Regarding claim 33, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky disclose the system discussed in claim 32, and Kougiouris further discloses examining said event message to determine if said event message includes one of said selected event messages (see paragraphs [0038]-[0040], [0049], and [0075]).

7.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris and Kraslavsky as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Maeda.

Kraslavsky discloses wherein said first event log may be reset (see column 38 lines 4-42, column 39 lines 1-21, and Table 8).

Kougiouris and Kraslavsky do not disclose expressly wherein said first event log may be reset by replacing a printer component.

Maeda discloses wherein a printer is reset by replacing a printer component (see column 8 lines 4-17 and column 11 lines 31-45).

Kougiouris, Kraslavsky, & Maeda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, monitoring and control of processes executed on systems and devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the resetting of a printer by replacing a printer component as described by Maeda with the system of Kougiouris and Kraslavsky.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to accurately log events that specifically relate to each component of a printer device. It is well known in the art to reset printers after a component is replaced and therefore it would have been obvious to reset the event log when a component of the printer is replaced to account for all the features present in the new component.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maeda with Kougiouris and Kraslavsky to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

8.   Claims 9, 14-16, 23, 30, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris and Kraslavsky as applied to claims 8, 12, 21, 29, and 32 above, and further in view of Venkatraman.

Regarding claims 9 and 30 Kougiouris discloses wherein said virtual event log comprises an event log displayed on an interface (see Fig. 3 and paragraph [0046]).

Kougiouris and Kraslavsky do not disclose expressly wherein said virtual event log comprises an event log displayed as a web page-like interface.

Venkatraman discloses displaying information relating to the control and functionality of a printer displayed as a web page-like interface (see Fig. 3, column 3 lines 5-41, column 4 lines 17-28, column 6 lines 56-62, and column 7 lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 14, 23, and 43, Kougiouris discloses wherein said user can configure said second event log through an interface (see Fig. 3 and paragraph [0046]).

Kougiouris and Kraslavsky do not disclose expressly wherein said user can configure said second event log through a web page-like interface.

Venkatraman discloses displaying information relating to the control and functionality of a printer displayed as a web page-like interface (see Fig. 3, column 3 lines 5-41, column 4 lines 17-28, column 6 lines 56-62, and column 7 lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 15 and 35, Kougiouris and Kraslavsky do not disclose expressly wherein said web page-like interface comprises a web age-like interface generated within a printer utility program.

Venkatraman discloses wherein said web page-like interface comprises a web age-like interface generated within a printer utility program (see column 3 lines 5-42, column 4 lines 17-28, and column 7 lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 16 and 36, Kraslavsky discloses accessing an interface through a printer control panel (see Fig. 3 "116" and column 8 lines 21-23).

Kougiouris and Kraslavsky do not disclose expressly accessing said web page-like interface through a printer control panel.

Venkatraman discloses displaying information relating to the control and functionality of a printer displayed as a web page-like interface (see Fig. 3, column 3 lines 5-41, column 4 lines 17-28, column 6 lines 56-62, and column 7 lines 23-30).

Kougiouris, Kraslavsky, & Venkatraman are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, monitoring and control of processes executed on systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to combine the web page-like interface for controlling a printer as

described by Venkatraman with the system of Kougiouris and Kraslavsky.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the range,

flexibility, and functionality of a system by providing a widely accessible user interface to

control devices (see column 1 lines 9-12 and 36-43 and column 2 lines 13-26 of

Venkatraman).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Venkatraman with Kougiouris

and Kraslavsky to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 14-16, 23, 30, and 34-

36.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5857190 to Brown discloses a system that logs events based on

logging criteria and selects an appropriate storage location for the log event information

based on the kind of events being logged.

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571) 272-

7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Twyler M. Lamb can be reached at (571) 272-7406. The fax number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark R. Milia
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

MRM

JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART DIVISION 2625